App F IX 4

Previous References
Mc 155-33-1+2
Mc 155-33-9+12

Later References

1943-44
Municipal

File No 98—43
Serial Nos 9, 14, 45

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos Nil

Part B for Aug 1944

SUBJECT

Remission of Rs 60/- in favour of Mr Mohamed Khan Saheb, Market Contractor, Shiyali on grounds of the alleged loss consequent on the issuing of Food Control orders

To

The D.C., Chingleput

L1837 of 25/8/44

States that Govt are not in favour of granting remission in cases referred to above

Nil
31/8/44

C/F No 45]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Telegram / phone

No A6 179/43-44
Encls One file

OFFICE OF SEP 1943

The Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District,
Chitaldrug

Date 26th September, 1943

To Rao Bahadur M. Narayana Shama Naidu, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Government, Law Department,
BANGALORE

Sir

In forwarding herewith the entire file of correspondence ending with report No. 87/42-43 dated the 22nd August, 1943 received from the Municipal Council, Chitaldrug, recommending that a remission of Rs 60/- be granted to the said Contractor for collecting fees in the Cattle Shandies at Hiriyur, I have the honour to state that the right of collecting fees as sold by Public Auction for Rs 620/- for the year 1942-43, Mr. Mahamed Khan, Contractor, represented to the Municipal Council that he was incurring heavy loss in his contract on account of the introduction of the food grains control order and that consequently there was considerable decrease in the number of carts coming to the shandy. The petition of the contractor was placed before the Municipal Council at its meeting convened on the 28th December, 1942 when it was resolved that a remission of Rs 60/- per month from July to end of December 1942 be granted. The accounts of the contractor have been checked by the Municipal Staff and it was found that a sum of Rs 160-0-6 had been realised by him up to end of November 1942 against the monthly rental of Rs 51-10-6 payable by him. Against the annual rental of Rs 620/- payable by him, it is reported that the contractor has to pay a balance of only Rs 75-15-7, out of which, a sum of Rs 60/- is recommended for remission.

Under the circumstances reported above, I request that Government may be pleased to accord sanction to the remission of

2072/-

-2-

remission of Rs .C/- as recommended by the Municipal Council
A copy of the resolution of the Council is enclosed in the
records

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Deputy Commissioner,
Cuddalore District

SP

1) A remission of Rs 60/- has been recommended by the D.C Chittoor at the rate of Rs 10/- per month for 6 months to December 1942 as per resolution where the case proposals is for orders.

HMS 4.10.43 JH

2) Pl note if the Municipal Council or the D.C Chittoor has not got powers to remit this small amount, as it is a revenue & miscellaneous nature Powers are also in other cases due to the Municipal Council.

6/10/43

3) A copy of the Circular G.O is put up Vide Flag K. In a similar case of remission under Compromise, Govt in Ms 155-33 89H2 their letter to the D.C referred to Sec 176 (d1) of the Town Municipalities and also to the Circular G.O Vide Flag O. The G.O does not specifically limit the amount involved. Subject to reference to the above

HMS 14/10/43 JH

4) Mr K.H.S
Pl put up copy of the G.O. regarding remission
enclosed by the Municipal Council

5) Subject
A copy of the G.O referred to replaced below (Flag Z)
Kum 14/10/43 under para 1 of the said G.O this has been submitted to Govt.
JH 14/10

6) What was the claimant the contractor realize for the whole season 1942-43 according to his account? Why should the remission be granted for only six months from April 1942 to end October 1942 only? Did he ever make any claim for the subsequent months?

25/10/43

7) Dft letter requiring the information

29/10/43

8) Reply received

To the DC Chitaldrug vide
letter No L 4507 dt 29 10 43
Calls for information on certain points

Letter No HG 179/43-44 dt 7 11 43 from the DC Chitaldrug vide furnishing the information called for

8) Attention is invited to para 6 supra
The DC. states that Rs 60/- is a reasonable amount to be remitted

9) The Honigere munsif must have recommended the remission of a sum of Rs 60/- in favour of the Mahomed Khan Sahib, market contractor at Honigere for the year 1942-43 He has reported that the contractor has sustained real loss on account of the food grains control order & the consequent reduction in the number of

TYPING SECTION
26 OCT 1943
GEN & REV SECTT

4) Continuation Sheet File No / Current No of Page

Removal of the block one from the market
Contractor of Hungate

Carts Coming to the Army.
The D.C. Chilling supports the above recommendation as being reasonable
Hence a remission of £3 6d for the year 1944 may perhaps be sanctioned in favour of the Contractor of the Army at Hungate

Lawrey 2/7 44

10) We have not been granting remissions on grounds of alleged loss consequent on licensing of food vehicles.

Mackesy SC 26-7 44

11) Noted
30 7 44
Lee
31-7 44
L
31 7

12) Returned with a draft letter
MSB 14/8

13) Agreed
15/8 Lee

L 18371 29 2 5 8 Lee 2a to D.C. Chilling
States that grant already in favour of County Renting
& Contracting on grounds of alleged loss consequent
on licensing of food carrier vehicles

WD 1140—GPB—50 000—5-11-42

B
BA 30/8

REGY LAW DEPT 1365 2 GUILDHALL
OFFICE OF TREATIES FOREIGN DESPATCH Date 24-7-44 No 641
TYPING SECTION 15 AUG 1944 CENTRAL REGISTRY

Dno 2022 Z dft

L 4507/43/R

General & Rev. Secy (5)

Rec 98-43-14

To The DC Chitaldrug or 29/X

Sir

With reference to your letter No. Nil 179/43-44 dated 26th September 1943 recommending a remission of Rs 60/- in favour of Mr ~~Hayath~~ Mohmed Khan Sahib, Shanbhag Contractor, Hiriyur for the year 1942-43 I am directed to request you to furnish information on the following points:-

1) What is the amount which the Contractor realised for the Whole year 1942-43 according to his accounts?

2) Why should the remission be granted for only six months from July 1942 to end of December 1942 only?

3) Did he incur any loss really for the Whole year? Necessary accompany for reference & return with the reply

Yours obedt
26/XII/43
for Secy

29/12

Judgment before
Mr Lawrence
14/6

WD (4161—GPB—60 000—24 10 41

Tel. Address —Depcom
CHITALDRUG

In reply please refer to
No A6.179/43-44
Enclosures

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
CHITALDRUG DISTRICT

Dated Chitaldrug 7th July, 1944

GEN & REV SECN. GOVT 277 12 JULY 1944 L S G BRANCH

SECY LAW DEPT 10 JY 44 GOVT OF MYSORE

FROM

A C Nirvani Gowda, Esq , B A ,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District
C H I T A L D R U G

To

C' Narayanaswami Naidu, Esq , B A , B L ,
Legal Remembrancer & Secretary to Government,
Law Department, B A N G A L O R E

Sir,

Sub Remission of Rs 60/- in favour of Mr Mohamed-Khan Sahib, Market Contractor, Hiriyur - - -

With reference to your letter No L 4507/Muni 98-43-14, dated the 29th October, 1943, calling for further information on the above subject, I have the honour to state that the President of the Municipality reports that the total realisations during the first six months was only Rs 192/- and that a sum of Rs 450/- was collected by the contractor for the whole vear as against the annual rental of Rs 620/-

2 It has been reported by the President that the Contractor applied for the grant of remission for six months only and that the contractor says that he incurred a loss of Rs.110/- The President is of opinion that the loss sustained by the contractor is a fact and that Rs 60/- is a reasonable amount to be remitted

In enclosing herein the entire file of records ending

WD 04161—GPB—60 000—24 10 41

Mg Law Dept 14/8

ending with Hiriyur Municipal President's report No. 67/42-43, dated the 29th June, 1944, I request that Government may be pleased to accord sanction to the remission of Rs.60/- as recommended by the Municipal Council which is supoorted by the President of the Municipality

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug District

SPH.

Appendix F G —1]

SUBJECT

AGS

8

Section ML
File No 98-43
Serial No 45

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the *194*

Date of issue 28/8/44

Signed by

List of enclosures

Codied by

Examined by

No L 1837 Dated 25/8/44

To

The DC, Chittalong

Sir,

With reference to your letter No AG 179/43-44 & 7-7-44 Re remission of Rs 60/- in favour of Mr Mohamed Khan Sahib, Market Contractor, Hereupon, I am directed to state that Govt are not in favour of granting remissions to contractors on grounds of alleged loss consequent on the passing of Food Control orders accompanying the records I have the

from Govt to Govt

Mg. Law Deptt
14/8

WD 04161—GPB—60 000—24 10 41

App F XI—4]

28 (4

Sus Regr No.

nil File No 98-43-

Shall a reminder issue to D.C. Guidg

Serial No 14

L-4507

for a reply to this Office No , dated the 29/10/43

Subject

Case for certain information re remission of Rs 60/- due from Mr. Md Khan Sahib, Steamer Contractor Hirapur.

PG 16/11

June reminder
JH.
3/3

REMINDERS

No	Date	
L 9137	3/3/44	